

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1-54 have been cancelled. New claims 55-63 have been added. The features in these claims generally correspond to those found in previously presented dependent claims without certain features recited in previously presented independent claims 1, 18 and 35, as follows*:

New Claim	Old Claim
55	7
56	8
58	24
59	25
61	41
62	42

Claims 57, 60 and 63 have also been added to include features from previously presented dependent claims 2 and 4 (claim 57), 19 and 21 (claim 60), and 36 and 38 (claim 63).

Remarks Concerning Patentability

The newly added claims all relate to a history feature that includes two types of resources, both of which were accessed by the user: an

* Additional differences between these claims are discussed below

interactive television program guide display, and a web site. Unlike single-resource history lists, applicant's claimed history list allows user to see (and in some embodiments access) guide and non-guide resources (in this example web sites) that the user previously accessed with the user's equipment.


Legall et al U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565 does not disclose such a history feature. As far as applicants can determine, the operation of Legall's "Recent" button is not described. Consequently, there is no basis for concluding what the button provides for or how it behaves. One might consider that button allows the user to access a list of recently accessed websites, but even this would be speculation and, at bottom, would only be a list of one type of resource.

The Examiner cites, among other portions, the portion of Legall at col. 4 lines 45-48 as allegedly disclosing a history list, but this is not the case. The cited portion of Legall describes various embodiments of Legall's search results display - see col. 4, lines 35-45. Lines 45-48 describe an embodiment where, instead of accessing web sites directly from the search list, users may switch between web site results by using forward and backward. For clarity, applicants have recited in the newly added claims that the first and second resources are "included in the history list because [they were] accessed by a user using the user television equipment" to avoid any conclusion by the Examiner that a search results list (where results are included

because they were matched to a query, not because they were accessed by the user) could be a history list (support for this element may be found at, for example, paragraphs 132 and 166).*

In view of the foregoing, applications respectfully request that newly added claims 55-63 be considered and allowed. Reconsideration and allowance of this case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



Richard M. Feustel, Jr.
Registration No. 46,698
Attorney for Applicants

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000

* In view of the Examiner's comments regarding previously-presented claim 7, it should also be pointed out that lines 45-48 concern only one type of resource - web sites. There is no discussion in Legall of the user having forward-backward functionality for EPG search results.